

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Examiner : Terry K. Cecil
Group Art Unit : 1723
Applicants : Roy W. Kuennen et al
Appl. No. : 10/767,035
Filing Date : January 29, 2004
Attorney Docket No. : 018716.085303-001
For : POINT-OF-USE WATER TREATMENT SYSTEM

MS ISSUE FEE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Applicants respectfully submit these Comments on the Statement of Reasons for Allowance mailed June 1, 2007 in connection with the Notice of Allowance of the above-identified patent application.

The Statement of Reasons for Allowance at Pg. 3 provides in pertinent part that:

The closest cited art—WO 96/33135—fails to anticipate or render obvious, alone or in any proper combination, the reflector including at least one diminishing radii of curvature transitioning to corresponding constant radii portions, wherein the bulb is positioned adjacent the conduit—within the lamp assemblies of claims 32 and 71. This limitation is shown in e.g. applicant's figures 21B and 22, wherein reference no. 434 indicates the constant radii portion and 436 the diminishing radii portion. In WO '135, the reflector is elliptical and necessarily precludes a constant radii portion since the radius of an ellipse continually changes; therefore, also in WO '135, the bulb cannot be placed adjacent a constant radii portion.

Applicants respectfully point out that with respect to independent claim 32, WO 96/33135, as well as all the other cited art, fails to anticipate or render obvious the subject matter of that amended claim because those references fail to disclose, teach or suggest that diminishing radii of curvature transition at locations opposite the curvature peak to corresponding constant

Applicants : Roy W. Kuennen et al
Appl. No. : 10/767,035
Page No. : 2

radii portions of the reflector assembly, wherein the conduit is positioned adjacent at least one of the constant radii portions. Not only does WO '135 preclude the bulb being placed adjacent the constant radii portion, but this reference also precludes the conduit being positioned adjacent at least one of the constant radii portions and vice versa.

With respect to independent claim 71, Applicants point out that WO 96/33135 as well as all the other cited art, fails to anticipate or render obvious the subject matter of that amended claim because those references fail to disclose, teach or suggest at least one of the plurality of diminishing radii of curvature that transition at an inflection point to corresponding constant radii portions, at least one of the constant radii portions being adjacent the conduit. In addition, not only does WO '135 preclude the bulb being placed adjacent the constant radii portion, it also precludes the constant radii portions being adjacent the conduit and vice versa.

Respectfully submitted,

ROY W. KUENNEN ET AL

By: Warner Norcross & Judd LLP

/Gregory P. Bondarenko/

Gregory P. Bondarenko
Registration No. 44,547
900 Fifth Third Center
111 Lyon Street, N.W.
Grand Rapids, MI 49503-2487
(616) 752-2420